

DANIEL R DRAKE  
DRAKE LAW, PLC  
4340 East Indian School Road  
Suite 21-113  
Phoenix, Arizona 85018  
drakelawplc@gmail.com  
Arizona State Bar No. 003781  
Telephone (602) 881-5341  
Attorney for Defendant

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

United States of America,  
  
Plaintiff,

v.

Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem,  
  
Defendant.

2:15-cr-00707-SRB

**Second Unopposed Motion to  
Extend Stay of Briefing on  
Supplemental Motion for New  
Trial (Doc. 505)**

Defendant Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem moves the Court to extend by 90 days to February 25, 2019, the stipulated stay of briefing on Defendant's supplemental motion for a new trial based on newly discovered evidence (Doc. 505). The stay was entered by this Court on August 3, 2018 (Doc. 516) and stayed briefing to October 1, 2018. It then extended the stay from October 1, 2018, to November 30, 2019. (Doc. 518.) This extension is requested based on the efforts the parties have been making to prepare this matter for full briefing, as detailed below.

This motion and the relief requested have been discussed with Asst. U.S. Attorney Joseph E. Koehler. The government has no objection to the requested extension of the stay.

Excludable delay under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h) will not occur as a result of this notice or an order based thereon.

////

////

Respectfully Submitted this 27<sup>st</sup> day of November 2018.

MAYNARD CRONIN ERICKSON  
CURAN & REITER, P.L.C.

DRAKE LAW, PLC

s/Daniel D. Maynard  
DANIEL D. MAYNARD

s/Daniel R. Drake  
DANIEL R. DRAKE

#### STATUS REPORT AND BASIS FOR EXTENSION

The defense filed its supplemental motion for new trial (Doc. 505) on June 11, 2018, based on newly discovered evidence. On July 26, 2018, the government disclosed information shared by government prosecutors during the prosecution of Erick Jamal Hendricks in the Northern District of Ohio. As anticipated at the time, some of this information might prove useful in briefing and presenting the new trial motion, including a defense addendum. And, as anticipated and reflected in the party's stipulation (Doc. 514), the defense did wish to seek further disclosures based on the July disclosures.

The disclosures in late July consisted of heavily redacted email communications among the FBI undercover agent referred to as "Stephen Jane" and other FBI employees, including some intelligence analysts, and a heavily redacted FBI internal document entitled "Garland Shooting Incident Review."

On September 6, 2018, following its review of the late July disclosures, the defense requested further disclosures in a six-page letter specifically identifying information requested and the reasoning supporting each request. The parties spoke briefly following the request and, on September 10, 2018, the government sent a written response stating it intended to respond to the request in a substantive and complete

1 fashion and provide additional information where appropriate. It anticipated it might take  
2 a few weeks to complete its response.

3 Nothing has come from the government to date in the form of objections to the  
4 September 6, 2018, request or production of requested information. In a phone  
5 conversation on November 27, 2018, AUSA Koehler indicated he had been meeting with  
6 the FBI to resolve disclosure issue and has additional meetings planned.

7 The defense wants access to the requested information as it believes it would  
8 strengthen its arguments for new trial or lead to the discovery of material information.  
9 That was the reason for the initial stay of briefing, and it remains a viable reason today.  
10 Delay does not benefit the defendant; he believes he is innocent and should not be in jail.  
11 Nevertheless, the potential benefit of the requested information is a mighty reason to  
12 pursue it.

13 Because of the delays encountered and the prospects of further discussion or  
14 disputes about what could or should be produced, a term of 90 days is requested. Should  
15 the disclosure issue resolve itself within the time allotted, the defense would supplement  
16 its motion with additional information or request a response to the motion by the  
17 prosecution. Unfortunately, the defense does not control the timing or substance of  
18 disclosure.

19 CONCLUSION

20 The foregoing demonstrates the diligence of the parties and justifies the extension  
21 of the stay of briefing for an additional 90 days until February 25, 2019.

22  
23 Respectfully Submitted this 27<sup>st</sup> day of November 2018.

24 DRAKE LAW, PLC

25 *s/Daniel R. Drake*

26 DANIEL R. DRAKE  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on November 27, 2018, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to CM/ECF registrants:

AUSA Joseph E. Koehler  
AUSA Kristen Brook

s/Daniel R. Drake